PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

	From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY					REC'D 24 AUG ZILLS		
	To:				Mile .	WIPOPCT PCT		
					•			
				·	WRITTEN OPINION OF THE			
		see ionn r	PCT/ISA/220	-	INTERNATION	INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY		
					(PCT Rule 43bis.1) Date of mailing			
l				·	(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)			
		nt's or agent's file i rm PCT/ISA/22			FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below			
		ional application N P2005/001168		International filing date (000000000000000000000000000000000000	day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year) 05.02.2004		
	_	ional Patent Class 15/11, C12Q1/6	•	ooth national classification	and IPC			
	Applicar NOVA	nt IRTIS AG						
l								
	1. T	his oninion co	ntaine indicatio	ons relating to the foll	lowing items:			
	·	_		•	owing items.			
		Box No. I	Basis of the op	inion				
		Box No. II	Priority					
		Box No. III		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ard to novelty, inve	ntive step and industrial applicability		
		J Box No. IV	Lack of unity of	·	4 7 1 9 1 1 1 1 1			
	Ľ	Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bi applicability; citations and explanation Box No. VI Certain documents cited						
						·		
	<u></u>	Box No. VII	7	s in the international app				
	· [J Box No. VIII	Certain observ	ations on the internation	nal application			
	2. FURTHER ACTION			•				
•	If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.							
	If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.			lments, before the expiration of three				
	· F	or further option	ns, see Form PC	CT/ISA/220.		•		
	3. F	or further detail	s, see notes to l	Form PCT/ISA/220.	• •			
•			· · · · · ·			•		
	<u> </u>							

Name and mailing address of the ISA:

Authorized Officer

9)

European Patent Office .
D-80298 Munich
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Sprinks, M

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7706



	Во	x N	o. I Basis of the opinion		
1.	1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.				
		la	nis opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following nguage , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search nder Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).		
2.	Wit	th recess	egard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and sary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:		
	a. t	ype	e of material:		
			a sequence listing		
			table(s) related to the sequence listing		
•	b. format of material:				
			in written format		
			in computer readable form		
	c. t	ime	of filing/furnishing:		
•			contained in the international application as filed.		
			filed together with the international application in computer readable form.		
			furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.		
3.		na co	addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto s been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional pies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as propriate, were furnished.		
4,	Add	ditio	nal comments:		
	Во	x No	o. II Priority		
1.	Ø	rec	e validity of the priority claim has not been considered because the International Searching Authority es not have in its possession a copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed or, where quired, a translation of that earlier application. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the sumption that the relevant date (Rules 43bis.1 and 64.1) is the claimed priority date.		
2.		na	is opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim is been found invalid (Rules 43 <i>bis</i> .1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international and date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.		
3.	Ado	litio	nal observations, if necessary:		

. - 7

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability						
The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:						
	the entire international application,					
\boxtimes	claims Nos. 11,12,14,15 (partially)					
because:						
	the said international application, or the said claims Nos. relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (specify):					
	the description, claims or drawings (indicate particular elements below) or said claims Nos. are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (specify):					
	the claims, or said claims Nos. are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.					
	no international search report has been established for the whole application or for said claims Nos. 11,12,14,15 (partially)					
	the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that:					
	the written form		has not been furnished			
			does not comply with the standard			
	the computer readable form		has not been furnished			
			does not comply with the standard			
	the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.					
	See separate sheet for further of	detail	ls			

International application No. PCT/EP2005/001168

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Yes: Claims

1-18

No: Claims

Inventive step (IS)

Yes: Claims

No:

Claims 1-18

Industrial applicability (IA)

Yes: Claims

1-18

No: Claims

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

International application No.

PCT/EP2005/001168

D1: HACKERMÜLLER J. ET AL.,: "towards a functional classification of ARE protein interactions" GENOME INFORMATICS, vol. 13, 2002, pages 326-327, XP002299091

V) Novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

Inventive step

- The present application does not satisfy the criterion set forth in Article 33 (3) PCT because the subject-matter of claims 1-18 does not involve an inventive step (Rule 65.1 and 65.2 PCT).
- D1 discloses the use of thermodynamic modelling to study the mechanisms of ARE-binding protein interactions. It specifically refers to <u>ELAVL1</u> (see claims 2 and 13), the importance of understanding <u>interference of other AREs with ARE-protein interactions for the selection of drug targets</u>, and ARE binding ELAVL1 analogues.

Consequently, the claimed methods and compounds are considered as the straightforward reduction to practice and results of the concepts taught in D1, which result from the combination of the skilled person's desire to modulate any known regulatory ARE-ligand interaction (which may be considered as the technical problem) with the teachings of D1.

It should be noted that the methods of claims 5 and 6 do not appear to be restricted to the general concept in claim 1 of calculating and using thermodynamic probabilities, since the phrase "that changes the thermodynamic probability" appears to refer to an implicit property of an oligonucleotide whose suitability as a modulator would be obvious in any event at the hybridisation step alone.

In such a case, said methods might not be considered novel or even unitary as they could refer to screening assays using known standards (which intrinsically change the thermodynamic probability in any event). However, for the time being, the Applicant is given the benefit of doubt.

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

T_{α} .	the RNATIONAL SEARCHI	NG AUTHO	PRITY		EC'D 24 AUG 2005		
To:.	•		•	My.	NIPOP G		
see form PCT/ISA/220				WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)			
				Date of mailing (day/month/year) se	e form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)		
Applicant's or agent's file reference see form PCT/ISA/220				FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below			
International application No. International filing date PCT/EP2005/001168 04.02.2005			International filing date (04.02.2005	day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year) 05.02.2004		
	national Patent Classificat 2N15/11, C12Q1/68	tion (IPC) or t	ooth national classification	and IPC	-		
	icant VARTIS AG				,		
1.	This opinion contain	ns indicatio	ons relating to the fol	lowing items:	·		
	Box No. 1 Basis of the opinion						
	☑ Box No. II Priority						
		•					
		•	nent of opinion with reg	ard to novelty, inventi	ve step and industrial applicability		
	☐ Box No. IV Lac	n-establishr ck of unity o	f invention		-		
	☑ Box No. III☑ Box No. IV☑ Box No. VReal	n-establishr ck of unity o asoned stat	f invention	is.1(a)(i) with regard to	novelty, inventive step or industrial		
	 ☑ Box No. III No. ☐ Box No. IV Lac ☑ Box No. V Resapp ☐ Box No. VI Cer 	n-establishrok of unity of asoned state of cability; claring docum	f invention ement under Rule 43 <i>bl</i> tations and explanation ents cited	is.1(a)(i) with regard to is supporting such sta	novelty, inventive step or industrial		
	Box No. III No. III No. III Box No. IV Lac app	n-establishr ck of unity of asoned stat plicablilty; ci rtain docum rtain defects	f invention ement under Rule 43 <i>bi</i> tations and explanation ents cited s in the international ap	is.1(a)(i) with regard to is supporting such sta plication	novelty, inventive step or industrial		
	Box No. III No. III No. III Box No. IV Lac app	n-establishr ck of unity of asoned stat plicablilty; ci rtain docum rtain defects	f invention ement under Rule 43 <i>bl</i> tations and explanation ents cited	is.1(a)(i) with regard to is supporting such sta plication	novelty, inventive step or industrial		
2.	Box No. III No. III No. III Box No. IV Lac app	n-establishr ck of unity of asoned stat plicablilty; ci rtain docum rtain defects	f invention ement under Rule 43 <i>bi</i> tations and explanation ents cited s in the international ap	is.1(a)(i) with regard to is supporting such sta plication	novelty, inventive step or industrial		
2.	Box No. III No. III Box No. IV Lac appropriate Box No. VI Certain Box No. VII Certain Box No. VIII Certain Box No. VIIII Certain Box No. VIII Box No. VIII Certain Box No. VIII Box N	n-establishmek of unity of asoned state of state	f invention ement under Rule 43betations and explanation ents cited s in the international ap- ations on the internation ity other than this one to	is.1(a)(i) with regard to is supporting such stand plication nal application made, this opinion with ang Authority ("IPEA").	novelty, inventive step or industrial		
2.	Box No. III No. III Box No. IV Lac app. Box No. VI Resapp. Box No. VI Cel Box No. VII Cel Box No. VIII Cel Box No. VIII Cel Box No. VIII Cel FURTHER ACTION If a demand for interrwritten opinion of the the applicant choose International Bureau will not be so consider this opinion is, as probable to the IPEA and th	n-establishmek of unity of asoned state of cability; che reain documentain defects reain observed an Author under Rule ered.	f invention ement under Rule 43bitations and explanation ents cited s in the international ap- ations on the internation liminary examination is al Preliminary Examining ity other than this one to 66.1 bis(b) that written ove, considered to be a	is.1(a)(i) with regard to is supporting such standard plication and application made, this opinion with a high Authority ("IPEA"). To be the IPEA and the opinions of this International written opinion of the opriate, with amendments.	novelty, inventive step or industrial tement Il usually be considered to be a However, this does not apply where a chosen IPEA has notifed the		
2.	Box No. III No. III Box No. IV Lac app. Box No. VI Resapp. Box No. VI Cel. Box No. VII Cel. Box No. VIII Cel. Box No. VIII Cel. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for interrwritten opinion of the the applicant choose International Bureau will not be so consider this opinion is, as proposed the submit to the IPEA are months from the date.	n-establishmek of unity of asoned state of cability; check of the contraction of the cont	f invention ement under Rule 43bitations and explanation ents cited s in the international ap- ations on the internation liminary examination is al Preliminary Examining ity other than this one to 66.1 bis(b) that written ove, considered to be ally together, where appring of Form PCT/ISA/220 of	is.1(a)(i) with regard to is supporting such standard plication and application made, this opinion with a high Authority ("IPEA"). To be the IPEA and the opinions of this International written opinion of the opriate, with amendments.	Il usually be considered to be a However, this does not apply where a chosen IPEA has notifed the ational Searching Authority IPEA, the applicant is invited to ents, before the expiration of three		
2.	Box No. III No. III Box No. IV Lac app. Box No. VI Cer app. Box No. VII Cer Box No. VIII Cer Box No. VIII Cer FURTHER ACTION If a demand for interr written opinion of the the applicant choose International Bureau will not be so consider this opinion is, as proposed to the IPEA are months from the date whichever expires later and the IPEA are months from the date whichever expires later and the IPEA are months from the date whichever expires later and the IPEA are months from the date whichever expires later and the IPEA are months from the date whichever expires later and the IPEA are months from the date whichever expires later and the IPEA are months from the date whichever expires later and the IPEA are months from the date whichever expires later and the IPEA are months from the date whichever expires later and the IPEA are months from the date whichever expires later and the IPEA are months from the date whichever expires later and the IPEA are months from the date whichever expires later and the IPEA are months from the date whichever expires later and the IPEA are months from the date whichever expires later and the IPEA are months from the date whichever expires later and the IPEA are months from the IPEA are months	n-establishmek of unity of asoned state of icability; che rain documentain defects of the reduction of the reduction of the reduction of mailing ter.	f invention ement under Rule 43bitations and explanation ents cited s in the international ap- ations on the internation liminary examination is al Preliminary Examining ity other than this one to 66.1 bis(b) that written ove, considered to be ally together, where appring of Form PCT/ISA/220 considered.	is.1(a)(i) with regard to is supporting such standard plication and application made, this opinion with a high Authority ("IPEA"). To be the IPEA and the opinions of this International written opinion of the opriate, with amendments.	Il usually be considered to be a However, this does not apply where a chosen IPEA has notifed the ational Searching Authority IPEA, the applicant is invited to ents, before the expiration of three		
	Box No. III No. III Box No. IV Lac app. Box No. VI Cere app. Box No. VII Cere Box No. VIII Cere Box No. VIII Cere FURTHER ACTION If a demand for interrestiten opinion of the the applicant choose International Bureau will not be so consider this opinion is, as proposed to the IPEA are months from the date whichever expires later For further options, so the IPEA are months from the date whichever expires later and the IPEA are months from the date whichever expires later and the IPEA are months from the date whichever expires later and the IPEA are months from the date whichever expires later and the IPEA are months from the date whichever expires later and the IPEA are months from the date whichever expires later and the IPEA are months from the date whichever expires later and the IPEA are months from the date whichever expires later and the IPEA are months from the date whichever expires later and the IPEA are months from the date whichever expires later and the IPEA are months from the date whichever expires later and the IPEA are months from the date whichever expires later and the IPEA are months from the date whichever expires later and the IPEA are months from the date whichever expires later and the IPEA are months from the IPEA are months f	n-establishmek of unity of asoned state of icability; che rain documentain defects of the reduction of the reduction of the reduction of mailing ter.	f invention ement under Rule 43bitations and explanation ents cited s in the international ap- ations on the internation liminary examination is al Preliminary Examining ity other than this one to 66.1 bis(b) that written ove, considered to be ally together, where appring of Form PCT/ISA/220 considered.	is.1(a)(i) with regard to is supporting such standard plication and application made, this opinion with a high Authority ("IPEA"). To be the IPEA and the opinions of this International written opinion of the opriate, with amendments.	I usually be considered to be a However, this does not apply where a chosen IPEA has notifed the ational Searching Authority IPEA, the applicant is invited to ents, before the expiration of three		

Name and mailing address of the ISA:

Authorized Officer

9)

European Patent Office D-80298 Munich Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Sprinks, M

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7706



_	Box No. I Basis of the opinion					
1.	With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.					
	This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).					
2.	With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:					
	a. type of material:					
	a sequence listing					
	☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing					
•	b. format of material:					
	□ in written format					
	☐ in computer readable form					
	c. time of filing/furnishing:					
	☐ contained in the international application as filed.					
	☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.					
	furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.					
3.	In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.					
4.	Additional comments:					
_	Box No. II Priority					
1.	The validity of the priority claim has not been considered because the International Searching Authority does not have in its possession a copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed or, where required, a translation of that earlier application. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date (Rules 43bis.1 and 64.1) is the claimed priority date.					
2.	This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43 <i>bis</i> .1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.					
3	Additional observations if necessary:					

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability						
	The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:					
	□ the entire international application,					
×	☑ claims Nos. 11,12,14,15 (partially)					
bed	cause:					
	the said international application, or the said claims Nos. relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (specify):					
	the description, claims or drawings (indicate particular elements below) or said claims Nos. are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (specify):					
	the claims, or said claims Nos. are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.					
	no international search report has been established for the whole application or for said claims Nos. 11,12,14,15 (partially)					
	the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that:					
	the written form		has not been furnished			
			does not comply with the standard			
	the computer readable form		has not been furnished			
			does not comply with the standard			
	the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.					
	See separate sheet for further details					

International application No. PCT/EP2005/001168

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Yes: Claims

1-18

No: Claims

Inventive step (IS)

Yes: Claims

No: Claims

1-18

Industrial applicability (IA)

Yes: Claims

1-18

No: Claims

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

D1: HACKERMÜLLER J. ET AL.,: "towards a functional classification of ARE protein interactions" GENOME INFORMATICS, vol. 13, 2002, pages 326-327, XP002299091

V) Novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

Inventive step

- The present application does not satisfy the criterion set forth in Article 33 (3) PCT because the subject-matter of claims 1-18 does not involve an inventive step (Rule 65.1 and 65.2 PCT).
- D1 discloses the use of thermodynamic modelling to study the mechanisms of ARE-binding protein interactions. It specifically refers to <u>ELAVL1</u> (see claims 2 and 13), the importance of understanding <u>interference of other AREs with ARE-protein interactions for the selection of drug targets</u>, and ARE binding <u>ELAVL1</u> analogues.
 - Consequently, the claimed methods and compounds are considered as the straightforward reduction to practice and results of the concepts taught in D1, which result from the combination of the skilled person's desire to modulate any known regulatory ARE-ligand interaction (which may be considered as the technical problem) with the teachings of D1.
- It should be noted that the methods of **claims 5 and 6** do not appear to be restricted to the general concept in **claim 1** of calculating and using thermodynamic probabilities, since the phrase "that changes the thermodynamic probability" appears to refer to an implicit property of an oligonucleotide whose suitability as a modulator would be obvious in any event at the hybridisation step alone.

In such a case, said methods might not be considered novel or even unitary as they could refer to screening assays using known standards (which intrinsically change the thermodynamic probability in any event). However, for the time being, the Applicant is given the benefit of doubt.